

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,202	04/26/2000	NORIKO SAKASHITA	000466	3928
23850	7590 09/12/2003			
ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000			EXAMINER	
			EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI	
WASHINGT	WASHINGTON, DC 20006			PAPER NUMBER
			ART UNIT	EK NOMBER
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	v		
. Advisory Action	09/530,202	SAKASHITA ET AL.			
, Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	 		
	Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	1713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	S		
THE REPLY FILED 10 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to n places the application	a in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appropriation	ate extension be action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below),			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simpli	fying the		
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ame	endment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT pla	ace the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were ne	wly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo) will be entered and w or appended.	an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	, v				
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .	,				
Claim(s) objected to: None.	•				
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.	•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.	•		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
10. Other: KELECHI C. EGWIM PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER					
		W			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments about the viscosity ranges may have been valid if the cited prior art disclosed a range which touches, overlaps or is within the claimed. In this case, the claimed range is clearly within the prior art range, and not overlapping. Applicant's arguments about overlapping ranges are not apposite. This is similar to a claimed species within a broader genus taught by the prior art. Not only does the cited prior art teach the claimed composition with all limitations met, even the claimed viscosity range falls within the range disclosed by the prior art. This is anticipation. Even if not anticipated, the claimed composition would still be obvious over the prior art teachings, with ranges that include the presently claimed range.